

### REMARKS

Claims 1-31, 33, 34, 36-38, 40, 41, 43-45, 47, 48, and 50-59 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

### Amendment

Corrected FIGS. 43-51 submitted herewith now include the legend "PRIOR ART." Moreover, FIG. 44 has been amended to correct reference "1507" (lower left) to --1508--.

The specification has been amended to remove all the informalities identified by the examiner. The present amendment to the specification obviates the drawing objections. A more descriptive title has been provided.

Claims 32, 35, 39, 42, 46, and 49 have been canceled and claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 31, 34, 38, 41, 45, and 48 have been amended. Independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 have been amended to define displaying identification information that allows a viewer to recognize that relevancy exists between the images recorded by the plurality of image recording apparatuses. Independent claims 31, 38, and 45 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of respective depending claims 32/35, 39/42, and 46/49. Dependent claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 20, 23, and 28 have been amended to further define the related image display screen feature deleted in their respective parent (independent) claims. New claims 52-59 have been added to further define the identification information and the content of the image recording apparatuses. See at least pages 48-49 and 53-54 for support.

No new matter has been introduced.

### Objection to Specification and Drawings

The present amendment to the title, specification, and the drawings obviate all objections raised by the examiner.

### Art Rejection

Claims 1-33, 35-40, 42-47, and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Honda (USP 6,606,451), and claims 34, 41, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Honda. Applicants submit that the pending claims define over Honda because Honda would not have taught displaying identification information that allows the viewer to realize that relevancy exists between the recorded images as set forth in

independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 26, and the features set forth in the canceled dependent claims that are now incorporated in independent claims 31, 38, and 45.

Independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 call for controlling the display device to display identification information that allows a viewer to realize that relevancy exists between the recorded images when the detecting device detects presence of relevancy therebetween. Referring to page 48 of the specification, the identification information can be, for example, a connecting icon, such as a tied string icon, that indicates to the viewer that the recorded images from multiple apparatuses are associated with each other.

Honda discloses an image reproducing apparatus 1 that provides viewing of a silver-halide film 4 and a video tape (DVC) 3. The images are recorded by an image shooting apparatus capable of simultaneous shooting, namely capable of performing silver-halide film shooting during video shooting. A still image and a moving image are simultaneously displayed on a display screen. See FIG. 10. In a simultaneous shooting mode, moving images are recorded onto the recording medium together with pieces of shooting information. See FIG. 7. Upon completion of the silver-halide film shooting, shooting conditions and shooting information are also recorded onto the film 4.

In Honda's image reproducing apparatus 1, when it is determined that the DVC 3 and the silver-halide film 4 are not simultaneously recorded based on the shooting information from these recording media not coinciding with each other, a message to change the DVC 3 or the silver-halide film 4 is displayed on a monitor 2. While Honda discloses simultaneous displaying a moving image with an associated still image, Honda fails to disclose or suggest displaying identification information, such as a connecting icon, that allows a viewer to recognize that relevancy exists between images recorded by image recording apparatuses, when the detecting device detects presence of relevancy therebetween. Accordingly, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 26 patentably distinguish over Honda within the meaning of § 102 and § 103.

Independent claims 31, 38, and 35 now incorporate the subject matter of their dependent claims 32/35, 39/42, and 46/49, respectively. Specifically, these independent claims define that the images from the second image source are images developed on a continuous time axis as one scene of an animated image. They further call for reading an image from the second image source associated with an image from the first image source so that reading-out of the image from the second image source is started from a leading position of the one scene or a position located at a particular interval before a particular intermediate point on the time

axis in the one scene when the image from the second image source associated with the image from the first image source is positioned at the particular intermediate point on the time axis.

In rejecting these dependent claims, the examiner merely identified FIG. 9 as disclosing the above features. Applicants submit that neither FIG. 9 nor any other passage of Honda discloses the above features. Indeed, the examiner merely identified the claim limitations without identifying which aspects of Honda disclosure correspond to the claimed limitations. Note that none of the passages identified by the examiner disclose anything having to do with the claimed features. If the examiner decides to maintain the same rejection, applicants request the examiner to clearly explain how and what aspects of Honda disclosure corresponds to the claimed limitations.

#### Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-31, 33, 34, 36-38, 40, 41, 43-45, 47, 48, and 50-59 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

05 OCTOBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)